



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/931,794	08/16/2001	William L. Jones	002.0221.01	3670	
7590 08/05/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
ZILKA-KOTAB, PC P.O. BOX 721120			SCHUBERT, KEVIN R		
SAN JOSE, CA		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ŕ			2137	2137	
			DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>.</u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>
Advisory Action	09/931,794	JONES ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	****
	Kevin Schubert	2137	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 CI	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	te extension fee ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ul> <li>2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further composed (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be</li> </ul>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41 37(e)), to I within the time period set forth in 3 but prior to the date of filing a brief, ensideration and/or search (see NO bw);	avoid dismissal of the property of the propert	e appeal. Since
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) double patenting rejection has been withdrawn.</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:	will not be entered, or b) will		_
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	rit or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.  10. The affidavit or other evidence failed to describe the sufficient reasons who it is necessar.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a

showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

13. Other:

EMMANUEL L. MOISE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's argument with regard to the Steinberg reference has been considered. The applicant argues that Steinberg does not teach that the removable storage medium stores a cryptographic key. The examiner disagrees. The removable storage medium does store a cryptographic key for use in decrypting the encrypted content (Col 6, lines 47-48; 58-59). The examiner fails to see the relevance of the applicant's argument regarding the PCMCIA card as the examiner never indicated the PCMCIA card stores the cryptographic key.

The applicant's argument with respect to the Friedman reference has also been considered. The applicant argues that the image frames in the Friedman are not being hashed and that only the additional information is being hashed to form the digital signature. The examiner disagrees. The purpose of Friedman's system is to provide a means to authenticate and verify the integrity of image frames. Additional data may be inserted in the frame and the image frame with the additional data is hashed together to produce the signature (CoI 4, lines 63-66). The original image file is transmitted with the digital signature. "Any alteration of the original image file transmitted with the digital signature, will result in a mismatch of the two hashes compared" (CoI 5, lines 5-8). Since any alteration of the image frame results in a mismatch of the hash, it is clear that the hash is comprised of the image frame. If the digital signature were merely comprised of the additional data and not the image file data as alleged by the applicant, an alteration of the image file would NOT result in a hash mismatch. See also (CoI 5, lines 56-65).